UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,665	01/23/2004	Andrew R. Ferlitsch	J-SLA.1378	9384

55428 7590 03/28/2008

ROBERT VARITZ
4915 SE 33RD PLACE
PORTLAND, OR 97202

EXAMINER	
MCLEAN, NEIL R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/763,665	FERLITSCH, ANDREW R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil R. McLean	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks Made in an Amendment filed 1/02/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-17 under Barrett et al. (US 5,647,056) in view of Chou et al. (US 2003/0204950) have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Chadez et al. (US 6,522,420)

Regarding Applicant's Argument:

"Lest the Examiner be uncertain about this dramatic difference between Barrett et al. and applicant's claims, the Examiner is encouraged to take a careful re-look at the text of the Barrett et al. reference, wherein discussion therein is replete with references **to the utilization of and need for an extra, independent circuit board structure.** In point of fact, the specification statement in Barrett et al. regarding Field of Invention opens with the **statement "The present invention relates generally to a circuit board which is coupled to a local area network peripheral...and which allows the peripheral to be an intelligent interactive network member..." (Emphasis Added).** Further, in column 2 of the Barrett et al. specification, the inventors state "...the present invention comprises a method and apparatus for managing access to a peripheral on a local area network by means of an interactive network board connectable to the

peripheral via a peripheral interface and connectable to the local area network via a network interface." (Emphasis Added).

Examiner's Response:

Barrett and Chou do not disclose expressly wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se

Chadez et al. discloses wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se **(The controller 26 controls operation of the printing mechanism 34 and the print engine 36. The controller's CPU 28 is preferably implemented as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) that is designed to support serial and parallel I/O functionality with the host, compress and decompress the raster data, communicate with the print engine, and send the host data to the engine as disclosed in Column 2, lines 45-51 and in Figure 2).**

Barrett and Chou & Chadez are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both all references disclose networked printers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put all the relevant configuration information including the firmware per se within(embedded) the imaging device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have one e.g., ASIC to perform both the processing and printing tasks using one controller. There is a need

to design printer firmware that performs both the processing and printing tasks using only one ASIC, while maintaining an acceptable engine speed as disclosed by Chadez in Column 1, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Barrett and Chou with Chadez to obtain the invention as specified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al. (US 5,647,056) in view of Chou et al. (US 2003/0204950) and further in view of .

Regarding Claim 1:

Barrett et al. discloses a method for downloading to a client device (PC 42 in Figure 2), and therein auto-configuring (Column 27, lines 4-6), an imaging device driver (Column 51, lines 31-33) which, along with relevant configuration information (Column 54, lines 36-43), is embedded (Column 10, lines 15-18) within the imaging device's included firmware per se (Printer 78 in Figure 2), said method comprising

establishing between the client device and the imaging device an operative connection (Column 7, lines 39-45), including a bi-directional, imaging-device communication port (e.g., 100 in Figure 3) which is

(a) compatible with both devices (Column 7, lines 48-54), and

(b) the port via which imaging-job information will be exchanged between the devices (e.g., exchange of data described in Column 7, lines 43-45);

in relation to said establishing, and utilizing the mentioned port, effecting a companion delivery download (Column 18, lines 35-55) therethrough from the imaging device to the client device (Column 41, lines 60-67; See Steps S1607 – S1612 in Figure 16) of the relevant configuration information (e.g., Column 42, Table 42).

Barrett et al. discloses all of the above limitations however Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device, and in association with said effecting and resulting delivery, auto-configuring in the client device the delivered imaging.

In the same field of endeavor of installing device drivers, Chou et al. discloses wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device ([0006], lines 1-6) and in association with said effecting and resulting delivery, auto-configuring in the client device the delivered imaging driver ([0016], lines 8-14; Figure 1, Step 120).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the built in driver of Chou et al. in Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be to make the installation of a new device easier and to make sure that the correct device driver is installed in the host to prevent conflicts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the built in driver of Chou et al. with Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Barrett and Chou disclose all of the above limitations.

Barrett and Chou do not disclose expressly wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se

Chadez et al. discloses wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se **(The controller 26 controls operation of the printing mechanism 34 and the print engine 36. The controller's CPU 28 is preferably implemented as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) that is designed to support serial and parallel I/O functionality with the host, compress and decompress the raster data, communicate with the print engine, and send the host data to the engine as disclosed in Column 2, lines 45-51 and in Figure 2).**

Barrett and Chou & Chadez are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both all references disclose networked printers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put all the relevant configuration information including the firmware per se within(embedded) the imaging device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have one e.g., ASIC to perform both the processing and printing tasks using one controller. There is a need to design printer firmware that performs both the processing and printing tasks using only one ASIC, while maintaining an acceptable engine speed as disclosed by Chadez in Column 1, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Barrett and Chou with Chadez to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding Claim 2:

Barrett et al. discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said effecting includes issuing from the client device to the imaging device a request though the communication port for the delivery of the driver and the configuration information (Column 7, lines 39-45).

Regarding Claim 4:

Barrett et al. discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the communication port employed is IEEE 1284 ECP parallel port (Column 5, lines 40-41).

Regarding Claim 7:

Barrett et al. discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the communication port employed is IEEE 1284 ECP parallel port (Column 5, lines 40-41).

Regarding Claim 8:

Barrett et al. disclose a setting which includes an operatively and communicatively interconnected (Column 7, lines 39-45) client device (PC 42 in Figure 2) and imaging device (Printer 78 in Figure 2), wherein the imaging device's firmware per se possesses an embedded (Column 10, lines 15-18) imaging driver (Column 51, lines 31-33) and related configuration information (Column 54, lines 36-43), and the imaging device is not yet installed on the client device (Column 54, lines 36-43), a method comprising

identifying, and preparing for use, a bi-directional communication port (e.g., 100 in Figure 3) via which imaging-job information may be exchanged between the two devices, and

using this port, sending from the imaging device to the client device the related configuration information (Column 18, lines 35-55),

Barrett et al. discloses all of the above limitations however Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device, and following said sending, and in the client device, auto-configuring the sent driver.

In the same field of endeavor of installing device drivers, Chou et al. discloses wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device ([0006], lines 1-6), and following said sending, and in the client device, auto-configuring the sent driver ([0016], lines 8-14; Figure 1, Step 120).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the built in driver of Chou et al. in Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be to make the installation of a new device easier and to make sure that the correct device driver is installed in the host to prevent conflicts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the built in driver of Chou et al. with Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Barrett and Chou disclose all of the above limitations.

Barrett and Chou do not disclose expressly wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se

Chadez et al. discloses wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se **(The controller 26 controls operation of the printing mechanism 34 and the print engine 36. The controller's CPU 28 is preferably implemented as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) that is designed to support serial and parallel I/O functionality with the host, compress and decompress the raster data, communicate with the print**

engine, and send the host data to the engine as disclosed in Column 2, lines 45-51 and in Figure 2).

Barrett and Chou & Chadez are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both all references disclose networked printers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put all the relevant configuration information including the firmware per se within(embedded) the imaging device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have one e.g., ASIC to perform both the processing and printing tasks using one controller. There is a need to design printer firmware that performs both the processing and printing tasks using only one ASIC, while maintaining an acceptable engine speed as disclosed by Chadez in Column 1, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Barrett and Chou with Chadez to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding Claim 10:

Barrett et al. discloses the method of claim 8, wherein said sending is preceded, and triggered, by a request process (Column 7, lines 39-45) which is initiated from the client device and communicated to the imaging device through the communication port.

Regarding Claim 12:

Barrett et al. discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the port which is identified and prepared is IEEE 1284 ECP parallel port (Column 5, lines 40-41).

Regarding Claim 13:

Barrett et al. disclose an embedded-driver downloading and configuring structure comprising an imaging device (Printer 78 in Figure 2) possessing within its firmware per se an embedded (Column 10, lines 15-18) driver (Column 51, lines 31-33) and related configuration information (Column 54, lines 36-43),

a client device (PC 42 in Figure 2) having the capability for operative installation of said imaging device,

a communication port (e.g., IEEE 1284 ECP parallel port; Column 5, lines 40-41) defining a shareable, compatible via for the exchange of imaging-job information between said devices (e.g., exchange of data described in Column 7, lines 43-45), and

appropriately inter-associated request (Column 7, lines 39-45), response and auto-configuring (Column 54, lines 36-43) structure distributively present in said client and imaging devices, operatively connected to said port, and operable, collaboratively, to effect a chain of events including

(a) a request from said client device (Column 7, lines 39-45) to said imaging device for the download configuration information,

(b) a responsive download (Column 18, lines 35-55) from said imaging device to said client device.

Barrett et al. discloses all of the above limitations however Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device, and an auto configuring of the downloaded driver in said client device.

In the same field of endeavor of installing device drivers, Chou et al. discloses wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device ([0006], lines 1-6), and an auto configuring of the downloaded driver in said client device ([0016], lines 8-14; Figure 1, Step 120).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the built in driver of Chou et al. in Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be to make the installation of a new device easier and to make sure that the correct device driver is installed in the host to prevent conflicts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the built in driver of Chou et al. with Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Barrett and Chou disclose all of the above limitations.

Barrett and Chou do not disclose expressly wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se

Chadez et al. discloses wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se **(The controller 26 controls**

operation of the printing mechanism 34 and the print engine 36. The controller's CPU 28 is preferably implemented as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) that is designed to support serial and parallel I/O functionality with the host, compress and decompress the raster data, communicate with the print engine, and send the host data to the engine as disclosed in Column 2, lines 45-51 and in Figure 2).

Barrett and Chou & Chadez are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both all references disclose networked printers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put all the relevant configuration information including the firmware per se within(embedded) the imaging device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have one e.g., ASIC to perform both the processing and printing tasks using one controller. There is a need to design printer firmware that performs both the processing and printing tasks using only one ASIC, while maintaining an acceptable engine speed as disclosed by Chadez in Column 1, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Barrett and Chou with Chadez to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Regarding Claim 15:

Barrett et al. discloses the downloading and configuring structure of claim 13, wherein said communication port is IEEE 1284 ECP parallel port (Column 5, lines 40-41).

Regarding Claim 16:

Barrett et al. discloses a communication-associated process involving

(a) a client device (PC 42 in Figure 2), and

(b) an imaging device (Printer 78 in Figure 2) which includes an embedded (Column 10, lines 15-18) driver (Column 51, lines 31-33) within its firmware per se and related configuration information (Column 54, lines 36-43), said process comprising

communicatively associating the two devices (Column 7, lines 48-54), and

thereafter, and employing the embedded driver and related configuration information (e.g., Column 42, Table 42).

Barrett et al. discloses all of the above limitations however Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device and equipping the client device with a fully configured installation of the driver

In the same field of endeavor of installing device drivers, Chou et al. discloses wherein the imaging driver is sent from the imaging device to the client device ([0006], lines 1-6) and equipping the client device with a fully configured installation of the driver ([0016], lines 8-14; Figure 1, Step 120).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the built in driver of Chou et al. in Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be to make the installation of a new device easier and to make sure that the correct device driver is installed in the host to prevent conflicts.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the built in driver of Chou et al. with Barrett et al.'s method for managing access to networked peripherals.to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Barrett and Chou disclose all of the above limitations.

Barrett and Chou do not disclose expressly wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se

Chadez et al. discloses wherein relevant configuration information is embedded within the imaging device's included firmware per se **(The controller 26 controls operation of the printing mechanism 34 and the print engine 36. The controller's CPU 28 is preferably implemented as an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) that is designed to support serial and parallel I/O functionality with the host, compress and decompress the raster data, communicate with the print engine, and send the host data to the engine as disclosed in Column 2, lines 45-51 and in Figure 2).**

Barrett and Chou & Chadez are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both all references disclose networked printers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to put all the relevant configuration information including the firmware per se within(embedded) the imaging device.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have one e.g., ASIC to perform both the processing and printing tasks using one controller. There is a need to design printer firmware that performs both the processing and printing tasks using only one ASIC, while maintaining an acceptable engine speed as disclosed by Chadez in Column 1, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Barrett and Chou with Chadez to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Regarding Claim 17:

Barrett et al. discloses the process of claim 16, wherein said equipping involves communicating the embedded driver and related configuration information directly from the imaging device to the client device via a selected imaging port (Column 16, lines 10-22) through which imaging-job information will be exchanged between the two devices during the shared implementation of an imaging job.

4. Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett, Chou & Chadez and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding Claim 3, and similar Claims 6, 11, and 14:

Barrett, Chou & Chadez discloses all of the limitations as disclosed in Claims 1, 8, and 13. However, Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the communication port employed is RAW port 9100.

Applicant discloses in the specification the **"well known bi-directional RAW port 9100"**; Page 6, lines 18-19).

Barrett et al. & Applicant's admitted prior art are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the Applicant's communication protocol RAW port 9100 as a means of communication in the image processing system of Barrett et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to have a well known, fast, proven, supported, and standardized communication port to ensure proper transmission of image data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Applicant's communication protocol RAW port 9100 with the image processing system of Barrett et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 6, 11, and 14.

Regarding Claim 5:

Barrett, Chou & Chadez disclose the method of claim 2 which is employed with a client device (PC 42 in Figure 2), and which further comprises integrationally linking the process of requesting (Column 7, lines 39-45), downloading (Column 18, lines 35-55) and auto-configuring with such process (Column 41, lines 60-67; e.g., Configuration Commands Table 9, Column 42); (Column 54, lines 36-43).

Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly an add-device process for installing a system device.

Applicant discloses in the specification the **"conventional create-installed – printer (add-device) process (22b in Figure 1)"** (Specification; Page 9, lines 10-11).

Barrett et al. & Applicant's admitted prior art are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of updating network devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the Applicant's admitted prior art method of installing add on devices with Barrett et al.'s method of managing a network peripheral.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to have a conventional, proven, supported, and standardized process when adding new devices to a system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Applicant's admitted prior art method of installing add on devices with Barrett et al.'s method of managing a network peripheral to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 5.

Regarding Claim 9:

Barrett, Chou & Chadez disclose the method of claim 8, wherein the client device possesses, and includes the capability to implement, an add-device process, and said sending and auto-configuring steps are effectively integrated with implementation of that process (Column 41, lines 60-67; e.g., Configuration Commands Table 9, Column 42); (Column 54, lines 36-43).

Barrett et al. does not disclose expressly an add-device process for installing a system device.

Applicant discloses in the specification the **"conventional create-installed – printer (add-device) process (22b in Figure 1)"** (Specification; Page 9, lines 10-11).

Barrett et al. & Applicant's admitted prior art are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of updating network devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the Applicant's admitted prior art method of installing add on devices with Barrett et al.'s method of managing a network peripheral.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to have a conventional, proven, supported, and standardized process when adding new devices to a system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Applicant's admitted prior art method of installing add on devices with Barrett, Chou & Chadez's method of managing a network peripheral to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 9.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lomas et al. discloses a method of enabling installation of a network printer onto a client processor and employing a server for managing printer installations.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. McLean whose telephone number is (571)270-

1679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571.272.7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Neil R. McLean/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
03/19/2008

/Gabriel I Garcia/

Acting SPE of Art Unit 2625